

April 11, 1997

OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

700 Central Building
810 Third Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104
Telephone (206) 296-4660
Facsimile (206) 296-1654

DECISION ON APPEAL OF THRESHOLD DETERMINATION

SUBJECT: Department of Development and Environmental Services
File Nos. **B96C0013** and **B96C0205**

THE GLEN
SEPA Threshold Determination Appeal

Property Located: 16045 Juanita-Woodinville Way NE,
near Bothell

**Property Owner/
Applicant:** Curt Pryde
c/o Dwayne Kohler/Kohler and Associates
1520-140th Avenue NE, Suite 101
Bellevue, WA 98005

Appellant: David F. Murphy, President
Wilshire Homeowners Association
11725 NE 165th Place
Bothell, WA 98011

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Division's Preliminary: Deny the Appeal
Division's Final: Deny the Appeal
Examiner: Grant in part and deny in part

PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

Notice of appeal received by Examiner: February 3, 1997
Statement of appeal received by Examiner: February 3, 1997

EXAMINER PROCEEDINGS:

Pre-hearing Conference: February 20, 1997
Hearing Opened: March 28, 1997
Hearing Closed: March 31, 1997

Participants at the public hearing and the exhibits offered and entered are listed in the attached minutes. A verbatim recording of the hearing is available in the Office of the King County Hearing Examiner.

ISSUES ADDRESSED:

- Land use - compatibility
- Traffic
- Trees, significant vegetation
- Aesthetics

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION:

FINDINGS:

1. On January 23, 1996, the Pryde 160th Street Apartments, LLC filed a building permit application (B96C0013) to construct a 137 unit townhouse and apartment complex on 6-1/2 acres within the R18-P and R24-P zones. Later, in October, a second building permit application (B96C0205) was filed to build a further 101 units as Phase II of the project. As currently proposed and reviewed, The Glen envisions constructing 240 units in two phases on 11.5 acres.
2. The Glen site currently comprises five tax lots each containing a single family residence to be removed upon redevelopment of the property. The site is bounded on the east by the Juanita-Woodinville Road, which provides access to the proposed development and currently serves the existing residences. To the east across Juanita-Woodinville Road a second apartment proposal, Woodbridge Pond, plans to develop 201 townhouses on 13.65 acres. For purposes of determining cumulative impacts, the Woodbridge Pond and Glen developments were reviewed concurrently under SEPA.

Northeast 160th Street, a minor arterial, lies a short distance south of The Glen, and Interstate 405 is close by to the west. A narrow undeveloped parcel buffers The Glen from Interstate 405. Northeast 160th Street, the I-405 interchange, a Metro park and ride lot southwest of the interchange, and Juanita-Woodinville Road, both north and south of Northeast 160th Street, have recently undergone major capacity upgrades which are just being completed. Traffic signals have been installed along the Northeast 160th Street corridor west of The Glen at the I-405 interchange

and to the east at 121st Avenue Northeast. Along the northern boundary of The Glen lies the Wilshire subdivision, whose homeowners' association has brought the instant threshold determination appeal.

3. Single family residential development currently exists within the eastern one-third of the five Glen parcels where each abuts Juanita-Woodinville Road. The northern four lots slope generally towards the west and are moderately to heavily wooded with second growth evergreen and deciduous trees. The southern portion of the site is more rural in character, with a large area of cleared pasture. Somewhat ironically, the feature which gives the proposed project its distinctive name--a narrow, wooded canyon in its northwest corner--is likely to disappear after construction. It will be largely cleared and filled for the development of proposed buildings J, K, and L.
4. A threshold determination of nonsignificance ("DNS") was issued for The Glen proposal by the King County Department of Development and Environmental Services ("DDES") on January 7, 1997. A timely appeal of the DNS was filed by David Murphy, president of the Wilshire Homeowners' Association, on behalf of the organization. A prehearing conference on the appeal was held by the King County Hearing Examiner's office on February 20, 1997, and a prehearing order issued the following day. The prehearing order identified as issues subject to appeal land use impacts to the Wilshire neighborhood resulting from development of the proposal, including effects on aesthetics, privacy and livability, and traffic impacts to the Wilshire neighborhood resulting from project development.
5. The northern boundary of The Glen abuts the city limits of Bothell. The property is within the City's Urban Growth Area, and its future fate is discussed within the Bothell Comprehensive Plan, which recommends maintaining a 100 to 150-foot transition zone where actual multi-family densities would approximate the single-family densities directly to the north. The currently allowed zoning density for Wilshire is four units to the acre, but as pointed out by County staff, the subdivision contains a large undeveloped tract on its western boundary, and actual lot sizes are mostly between 5,000 and 7,500 square feet. The tier of six lots along the Wilshire southern boundary adjacent to The Glen range between 4,992 and 6,808 square feet.
6. Applicable policies within the 1993 Northshore Community Plan are less specific than those adopted by Bothell, but they also recognize the need for a transition between the higher density, multi-family uses permitted on The Glen property and the lower density, single-family development existing to the north. In recognition of this goal, the 1993 Northshore Area Zoning designated The Glen properties GR5-P, with potential medium density RM-2400 zoning permitted on the north next to Wilshire and high density, RM-1800 zoning on the south near the arterial. During the 1995 County-wide zoning conversion process these densities were translated into their Title 21A equivalents and the potential zone requirements dropped.
7. In September, 1996 the Applicant's traffic consultant, TPE, Inc., issued a revised traffic study analyzing the project's potential impacts at those intersections where its traffic generation will exceed the thresholds stated in Ordinance 11617. In October a second study was done to analyze the project's impacts on the left turn storage lane where eastbound traffic on Northeast 160th Street queues before turning north onto Juanita-Woodinville Way. Two manual counts of PM traffic at the Northeast 160th Street/Juanita-Woodinville Way intersection were done, first in 1995 for the traffic study and again in 1996 for the queuing analysis. In late October, 1996 a third traffic count was done for the AM peak-hour. The 1995 and 1996 PM peak hour counts

done by TPE were generally comparable, with the total traffic count derived on October 15, 1996, actually being some 1.3% lower than that reported for August 30, 1995.

8. A manual traffic count also was done during the PM peak-hour on Tuesday, March 25, 1997, by Kevin Shigaya, a Boeing engineer who is a Wilshire resident. Mr. Shigaya's figures during the PM peak-hour for the critical turning movements at the Northeast 160th Street/Juanita-Woodinville Way intersection substantially exceed those cited within the TPE studies and are outside the range of normal variation. For the left turn movement eastbound on Northeast 160th Street turning north onto Juanita-Woodinville Way Mr. Shigaya's PM peak-hour count was 226 vehicles, while TPE counted 160 vehicles in 1995 and 143 vehicles in 1996. Similarly, Mr. Shigaya counted 155 vehicles southbound on Juanita-Woodinville turning right to go west on Northeast 160th Street, while TPE in 1995 counted 88 vehicles and in 1996 59 vehicles.
9. While there was considerable speculation at the hearing as to why Mr. Shigaya's PM counts were so much higher than those produced by TPE, no satisfactory explanation was generated. Mr. Shigaya's hypothesis that the TPE figures did not include a large 131 unit condominium project recently constructed on Juanita-Woodinville Way just north of Wilshire was rejected by the Applicant, who produced occupancy permit records indicating that most of the condominium units should have been occupied prior to October, 1996.

However, no flaws were identified in Mr. Shigaya's methodology, and from his engineering background and generally knowledgeable discussion of the issues he appeared to have a satisfactory technical grasp of the traffic evaluation process. Although still within the realm of speculation, a more likely explanation for the discrepancy in traffic counts is that normal traffic flows may have been temporarily reduced by the road construction projects which have recently dominated this neighborhood. This viewpoint is particularly suggested by the fact that TPE's traffic counts for the critical turning movements at Northeast 160th Street/Juanita-Woodinville Way are substantially lower for 1996 than for 1995. But whatever the explanation, the record presents no compelling rationale for rejecting Mr. Shigaya's figures as unreliable or preferring the TPE data.

10. According to TPE's projections the addition of The Glen and Woodbridge Pond projects to the neighborhood will double the levels of traffic turning to and from Juanita-Woodinville Way onto the western leg of Northeast 160th Street. This increase will change the PM level of service ("LOS") for the eastbound to northbound left turn movement from LOS B in 1995 to LOS E in 1998. TPE projects in 1998 a 37.9 second delay for traffic queuing within the left turn lane, with the threshold for moving to an LOS F designation being a 45 second delay. No one has recalculated the level of service for this movement based on Mr. Shigaya's traffic count, but if his figures accurately represent current traffic levels, it seems probable that the 1998 figure would be pushed to LOS F or very close to it.
11. If the PM peak left turn movement from Northeast 160th Street eastbound to Juanita-Woodinville Way northbound will indeed operate at LOS F in 1998 with addition of the two new apartment projects, the opportunities for mitigation of such an adverse condition will be extremely limited. Basically, the current road improvement projects just being completed by the state and King County will upgrade the affected roadways to their ultimate configuration.
12. TPE's October 18, 1996, report contains the T7F model run requested by the State Department

of Transportation to analyze the capacity of the left turn storage lane located on Northeast 160th Street between the I-405 ramps and Juanita-Woodinville Way. Due to the short distance between these two north-south roadways, no more than a six-vehicle storage lane is feasible. A maximum storage capacity of eight vehicles may be projected if one assumes that queuing cars will spill out of the storage lane into the intersection. More than eight vehicles waiting in this storage lane will produce gridlock at the I-405 ramp onto Northeast 160th Street.

13. The area road geometrics preclude either lengthening the storage lane or introducing another signal at the Northeast 160th Street/Juanita-Woodinville Way intersection. If the storage lane fills, the only alternative available to left turning traffic is to travel eastward past Juanita-Woodinville Way to 121st Avenue Northeast, which is signalized and capable of facilitating left turn movements. However, 121st Avenue Northeast north of Northeast of 160th Street is a neighborhood collector serving a residential neighborhood. Its use as a diversionary route for commuter traffic is not supported by adopted Comprehensive Plan policies. The remaining realistic alternatives, therefore, for alleviating an LOS F condition at the Northeast 160th/Juanita-Woodinville Way intersection would be either to reduce the number of units within the proposed apartment complex or to implement transportation management alternatives which increase transit use by Glen residents.
14. A related issue raised by the Wilshire Homeowners' appeal concerns the possibility that traffic from The Glen heading east on Northeast 160th Street will go north on Juanita-Woodinville Way to 121st Avenue Northeast in order to be able to make a signalized left turn at its intersection with Northeast 160th Street. While this possibility theoretically exists, the fact is that there is very little development east of Juanita-Woodinville Way on Northeast 160th Street which is likely to attract peak hour traffic. Therefore, traffic going east on Northeast 160th Street from The Glen, even if diverted to 121st Avenue Northeast, will have a minimal impact on the safety of the neighborhood collector route simply because the volumes will be so small.
15. The second area of major dispute between the Wilshire Homeowners' Association and the Applicant concerns the land use impacts of multi-family development on the single-family neighborhood to the north. While there are many potential ramifications to this relationship, the primary issue is one of visual impact. As proposed by the Applicant, there will be four three-story multi-unit buildings located within The Glen on or near its northern boundary. These include Building K, a six unit townhouse at the project's northwest corner, which will lie west of the developed portions of Wilshire. Further east will be Building L, containing eight townhouse units and sited opposite Lots 63 and 64 of Wilshire. The largest of the proposed structures will be Building M, comprising nine townhouse units to be located directly opposite Lots 65, 66, and 67 within Wilshire. Finally, at the project's northeast corner will be Building P, which lies near Wilshire Lots 68 and 69. All four buildings are proposed to be constructed at an elevation of approximately 44 feet. The existing homes within Wilshire are two story units with an overall height of approximately 24 feet.

16. If all intervening vegetation were removed, each of these four buildings within The Glen would be visible to one or more of the closest lots within Wilshire identified above. The impacts would vary. The most heavily impacted Wilshire residences would be those on Lots 65, 66 and 67, the rear portions of which would look squarely into the back side of Building M at distance ranging from 65 to 74 feet. Lot 67 would also have a clear view of the northernmost corner of Building P. The back of Building P would also be visible from the rear of Wilshire Lots 68 and 69, although at a more oblique angle and at a distance ranging between 80 and 120 feet. The least impacts would be experienced by Wilshire Lots 63 and 64, which are constructed at a lower grade than the adjacent northern boundary of The Glen. In addition, Building L is proposed to be set back about 80 feet from The Glen's northern boundary and therefore is substantially further removed from Wilshire than either Building M or P. In like manner, Building K only has six townhouse units and will lie southwest of Lots 63 and 64 a distance of more than 200 feet.
17. Both the Applicant and the Appellant have introduced computer-generated projections of the visual impacts of the proposed Glen buildings on the closest lots within Wilshire. If one ignores the controversy over which trees will survive as effective screening, the results of the computer models are remarkably similar. From the standpoint of the residents of Lots 65 through 69, absent screening their southerly views toward The Glen will be overwhelmed by Buildings M and P. The sheer bulk and mass of these buildings as a function of their height and length will dwarf the neighboring residences and dominate their southerly views. Without mitigation such impacts would be adverse and significant. With respect to Wilshire Lot 64, owing to the greater setback for Building L and the intervening topography the view impacts to this residence would be adverse but probably less than significant.

The Appellant also produced computer projections of prospective views of The Glen from properties further north within Wilshire. These graphics substantially exaggerate the height of The Glen buildings as seen from these more distant viewpoints. As depicted within Mr. Baum's graphic produced for the Applicant, in the absence of vegetative buffering the visual impacts of The Glen on Wilshire residences located on the north side of Northeast 165th Placed would be adverse but not significant.

18. As matters currently exist, a reasonably effective visual barrier of large second growth trees dominated by Western Red Cedar currently separates Wilshire from The Glen property. The first 22 feet of this wooded buffer lies within the Wilshire subdivision in the form of an undeveloped boundary tract. A second 20 feet of setback is proposed by The Glen in compliance with King County code requirements for setbacks between dissimilar residential uses. In addition, the County code requires that 10 feet of this setback meet the requirements of a Type 2 landscaping filtered screen which functions as a visual separator. This requirement will result in appropriate infill plantings along The Glen property line. Finally, the P-suffix conditions contained within the Northshore Area Zoning mandate the retention and protection of significant trees within the required perimeter buffer. The totality of zoning regulations applicable to this northern boundary, when combined with the greenbelt tract on the southern boundary of Wilshire, will produce a natural vegetated buffer of approximately 42 feet in width.
19. While the existing grove of trees lying between Wilshire and The Glen seem generally sufficient for screening purposes, the potential severity of the visual impacts to Wilshire properties, particularly those facing onto Building M, demands that the integrity of this screen be assured. Building M is proposed to occupy the area now generally containing the existing single-family

residence on the northernmost Glen parcel; therefore there is a well-defined boundary between the historically developed and undeveloped portions of that parcel. As proposed, Building M will extend into the existing natural vegetated buffer and place at risk some of the large trees which currently screen Wilshire Lots 65, 66 and 67. Of particular concern is a clump of evergreen trees near the eastern end of the Building M footprint directly opposite Wilshire Lot 66. They comprise a critical part of the existing screen and probably will be lost under the current development proposal. The importance of these trees lies not only in the proximity of Wilshire residences to Building M but also in the fact that the existing screen contains a major gap from approximately the property line between Lots 66 and 67 southwesterly toward the proposed footprint for Building M. If further screening trees are lost in this area, the impact of Building M on neighboring single-family properties would be correspondingly increased.

20. A second concern is assuring the physical survival of the trees which are proposed to be retained. While the Applicant's arborist and landscape architect dutifully testified that trees have been known to survive construction and grading activities within their drip lines, there can be no question that such contiguous construction activity greatly increases the risk of tree mortality. A cursory glance at the tree retention P-suffix condition applicable to this property demonstrates that the established County policy is to regard protection to the edge of the drip line to be the minimal requirement for tree survival. In the instant case, the importance of retaining this visual buffer intact strongly argues for a maximum level of protection. Moreover, a wider expanse of vegetated buffer area increases overall the ability of the grove to withstand wind and disease impacts.

The need to guarantee the integrity of the tree buffer supports increasing the required setback along the northern Glen property line an additional ten feet, which will create between the two developments an effective 50-foot buffer area. Increasing the buffer in this manner will not only assure the survival of the critical trees adjacent to proposed Buildings M and P, but also will improve the chances that the westernmost extension of trees will have sufficient vegetative mass to resist disease and windthrow. If in addition to this augmented buffer width a few large trees are required to be planted within the gap southwest of Wilshire Lots 66 and 67, a sizable and sturdy buffer zone of native vegetation can be preserved and significant adverse visual impacts to the Wilshire properties adjacent to The Glen boundary can be avoided.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The basic standard to be applied to the review of a threshold determination appeal is that the SEPA record must demonstrate the actual consideration of relevant environmental impacts. With respect to those relevant impacts shown to be actually considered, the decision of the SEPA official is entitled to substantial weight on review and shall not be reversed unless clearly erroneous based on the record as a whole.
2. In conjunction with the SEPA statute and regulations, KCC 20.24.080.D confers upon the Hearing Examiner broad authority to impose such conditions, modifications and restrictions on the appeal decision as may be required to make it compatible with the environment and carry out applicable statutes, regulations, codes, plans and policies. This authority supplements the SEPA appeal standards and allows specific conditions of mitigation to be imposed or modified independent of whether the determination of non-significance is found to be clearly erroneous.

3. The SEPA record discloses actual consideration by the Department of Development and Environmental Services of the potential environmental impacts of this proposal. Nonetheless, significant adverse environmental impacts in the category of land use and aesthetics will be experienced by the six lots along the southern Wilshire boundary closest to The Glen unless effective visual mitigation is assured. The existing grove of evergreen trees along the boundary between The Glen and Wilshire is capable of providing satisfactory impact mitigation so long as the survival of the trees is secured and necessary infill plantings are made. If conditions of mitigation are imposed on the project to provide an additional ten feet of vegetated buffer width and assure that an appropriate density of evergreen trees will be maintained, significant adverse land use and aesthetic impacts to the southernmost Wilshire lots can be avoided. Conditions to such effect will be imposed pursuant to SEPA, based on the substantive authority provided in Policies E-12, R-9, R-15 and R-17 of the Northshore Community Plan.
4. If Kevin Shigaya's counts are accurate, the existing quantity of left turn traffic moving from Northeast 160th Street eastbound onto Juanita-Woodinville Way northbound has been substantially understated within the Applicant's traffic studies. Although no specific level of service calculations have been done on the basis of Mr. Shigaya's data, his figures suggest that it is probable that this left turn movement may decrease to LOS F under 1998 conditions with the addition of traffic from The Glen. As defined within the County's Intersection Standards at Section 60 of Ordinance 11617, a project whose traffic impacts result in the creation of an LOS F intersection movement is deemed to have caused a significant adverse environmental impact. Also, under the facts which pertain to this intersection and the surrounding roadway system, the creation of congestion in excess of the storage capacity of the existing left turn lane on Northeast 160th Street could increase safety hazards to other traffic movements and result in diversionary traffic cutting through a residential neighborhood.
5. In order to assure that no LOS F condition will exist at the Northeast 160th Street/Juanita-Woodinville Way intersection, the level of service projections for the 1998 buildout condition will need to be recalculated using Mr. Shigaya's figures for the critical left turn movement. If Mr. Shigaya's figures result in a LOS F projection, a new traffic count should be done to verify their accuracy. If the new traffic count data confirms the LOS F projection for 1998, the Applicant will need to either reduce the number of units within the project or implement traffic demand management measures sufficient to reduce the trip generation rates for The Glen to a level where a LOS F condition will not occur. A MDNS condition has been added to the decision which implements this conclusion consistent with the substantive authority stated within Ordinance 11617, Comprehensive Plan Policies T-403 and T-526, and Northshore Community Plan Policies T-8 and T-19.
6. The Appellant's attorney has argued that imposition upon The Glen of conditions of mitigation under SEPA authority for land use impacts is precluded by Section 50 of Ordinance 12196 because the specific adverse environmental impacts of the project have been addressed by the chapters of Title 21A dealing with setbacks, landscaping, building facade modulation and the like. First, we note that the Phase I building permit for The Glen, which seeks to authorize development on the northern portion of the property, was filed in January, 1996 before the effective date of Ordinance 12196, which is April 1, 1996. Moreover, we also find that unusual circumstances relate to this site and proposal. They consist primarily of the special policies called out in both the Northshore Community Plan and the Bothell Comprehensive Plan

identifying unique issues at this particular location affecting the transition from single-family to multi-family residential densities.

7. If conditions of mitigation are imposed in the manner provided below, the decision of the SEPA official will not be clearly erroneous, is supported by the evidence of record and assures that there is no probability of significant adverse environmental impacts.

DECISION:

The appeal of the Wilshire Homeowner's Association is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. The following conditions of mitigation are imposed under authority of SEPA to mitigate the adverse environmental impacts of The Glen proposal.

ORDER:

This order constitutes the final King County mitigated determination of nonsignificance regarding the building permit applications for The Glen.

Mitigation under SEPA for this proposal includes the following conditions:

1. The northern 30 feet of The Glen property shall be retained as a native vegetation buffer and visual screen. No healthy evergreen trees shall be removed from the buffer area unless identified as safety hazards. The southern buffer boundary shall be clearly marked prior to any site clearing or grading, and the protective measures outlined in Section C of the Northshore Community Plan "Significant Vegetation Retention" P-suffix condition shall be implemented within the buffer area. A tree retention plan for the buffer area also shall be submitted and approved by LUSD prior to clearing and grading. (Northshore Community Plan Policies E-12, R-9, R-15 and R-17.)
2. At least three rot-resistant evergreen trees ten feet tall or higher shall be planted on or near the northern property boundary to fill the gap in the vegetative screen where Wilshire Lots 66 and 67 look southwesterly toward Building M. (Northshore Community Plan Policies E-12, R-9, R-15 and R-17.)
3. New level of service computations for the PM peak hour left turn movement from Northeast 160th Street eastbound to Juanita-Woodinville Way northbound shall be calculated for the 1998 buildout condition using Kevin Shigaya's traffic counts as the baseline figure. If LOS F is projected, a new traffic count shall be performed for the movement to verify the data, and the LOS again shall be calculated. If the new count still results in an LOS F projection for the buildout year, either the number of dwelling units for The Glen shall be reduced to the level necessary to obtain LOS E or the same objective shall be achieved by implementing a transportation demand management plan which reduces the level of project trip generation. Any proposed transportation demand management plan shall be approved by both LUSD and King County Department of Transportation. (Ordinance 11617, King County Comprehensive Plan Policies T-403 and T-526, and Northshore Community Plan Policies T-8 and T-19.)

ORDERED this 11th day of April, 1997.

Stafford L. Smith, Deputy
King County Hearing Examiner

TRANSMITTED this 11th day of April, 1997, to the following parties and interested persons:

Joe Aguilar
11711 NE 165th Place
Bothell, WA 98011

Lorraine Aquino
16125 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Jim Barborinas
1311 McLean Road
Mt. Vernon, WA 98273

Ron Baum
4131 Woodland Park Ave. No
Seattle, WA 98103

Robert Beaty
Attorney At Law
200 West Mercer, #108
Seattle, WA 98119

Marianne Carlson
11716 NE 165th Place
Bothell, WA 98011

Murray Cohn
16502 - 120th Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Lisa Creighton
16901 - 118th Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Brian/Dawn Crowley
12111 NE 165th Place

Bothell, WA 98011

Craig Cramer
16512 - 118th Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Mayor John Curtin
12131 NE 164th Street
Bothell, WA 98011

David/Erika Farthing
16909 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Vince Geglia
2101 112th NE #110
Bellevue, WA 98004

Rich/Chris Gessner
16815 - 118th Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Tom Gialanella
16525 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

David F. Murphy
11725 NE 165th Place
Bothell, WA 98011

Ron Gill
16515 - 118th Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Dennis Palmer
16415 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Brian Gilles
12823 NE 107th Place
Kirkland, WA 98033

Curt Pryde
50 - 116th Avenue SE, #200
Bellevue, WA 98004

Leslie Guerrein
16210 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Patti/Tracy Pugh
16315 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Dan Hazard
11721 NE 165th Place
Bothell, WA 98011

Thomas Reichman
16301 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

David Hope
12123 NE 164th Street
Bothell, WA 98011

Jean/Henry Reitan
16114 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Dwayne Kohler
1520 - 140th Avenue NE, #101
Bellevue, WA 98005

Tom Rengstorf
911 Western, Ste 444
Seattle, WA 98101

Anita/David Madtes
16323 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Kevin Shigaya
11731 NE 165th Place
Bothell, WA 98011

Doug Mangini
11705 NE 165th Place
Bothell, WA 98011

Janet/Michael Sullivan
12119 NE 165th Place
Bothell, WA 98011

Pam/Amitos Marwaha
16227 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

John/Brenda Towler
16307 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Debbie Merkley
16905 - 118th Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Derek Vincent
16416 - 118th Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Bob Minnott
2633 - 11th Avenue East
Seattle, WA 98102

Jon Weise
16407 - 121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Bill Wiselogle
City of Bothell
9654 NE 182nd Street
Bothell, WA 98011

Mary/Donald Zimmerman
16416-121st Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Aileen McManus, DDES/LUSD
Barbara Heavey, DDES/LUSD
David Baugh, DDES/LUSD
Josh Marx, KC Council
Michaelene Manon, DDES/LUSD
Paulette Norman, KC Dept. of Transp.
Greg Borba, DDES/LUSD

Pursuant to Chapter 20.24, King County Code, the King County Council has directed that the Examiner make the final decision on behalf of the County regarding SEPA appeals.

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 28 and 31, 1997, PUBLIC HEARING ON DDES FILE NOS.
B96C0013 AND B96C0205 - THE GLEN**

Stafford L. Smith was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. Participating at the hearing were Barbara Heavey, Aileen McManus and David Baugh, representing the County; Robert E. Beaty, Brian Gilles, Craig Cramer, Dwayne Kohler, Kevin Shigaya, Dan Hazard, Debbie Merkley, Marianne Carlson, Tom Rengstorf, Ron Baum, Vince Geglia, Curt Pryde, and Jim Barborinas.

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the hearing record March 28, 1997:

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Exhibit No. 1 | Department of Development and Environmental Services, Land Use Services Division, Report to the Hearing Examiner |
| Exhibit No. 2 | Determination of Nonsignificance for The Glen B96C0013/B96C0205 (E96E0057) issued January 7, 1997 |
| Exhibit No. 3 | Environmental Checklist dated January 23, 1996, and October 8, 1996 |
| Exhibit No. 4 | Appeal of Threshold Determination of Nonsignificance by David F. Murphy, President, Wilshire Homeowners Association dated January 18, 1997, received January 21, 1997 |
| Exhibit No. 5 | Site Plan The Glen Phase II, dated November 1, 1996 (also shows Phase I) |
| Exhibit No. 6 | Northshore Area Zoning map |
| Exhibit No. 7 | Comparative building sections (Sheet A2.0) and site plan key |
| Exhibit No. 8 | Northshore Community Plan Development Conditions P4 Significant Vegetation Retention |
| Exhibit No. 9 | Transportation Planning & Engineering, Inc. The Glen Revised Traffic Impact Analysis, September 17, 1996 |
| Exhibit No. 10 | Transportation Planning & Engineering, Inc., Northeast 160th Street TRANSYT-7F Queuing Analysis, October 18, 1996 |
| Exhibit No. 11 | Transportation Planning & Engineering, Inc., Facsimile Transmittal Letter to |

	Aileen McManus, October 31, 1996
Exhibit No. 12	SEPA file (submitted at hearing)
Exhibit No. 13	Assessor's map SW 9-26-5
Exhibit No. 14	Report by Brian Gilles, Appellants' arborist
Exhibit No. 15	Northern (Phase I) composite site plan submitted by Appellants
Exhibit No. 16	Photographs (18) from Wilshire neighborhood as it is now and computer enhanced to show how it will look after development
Exhibit No. 17	Diagram by Cramer and Kohler illustrating method used to calculate building heights for purposes of Exhibit 16 photographs
Exhibit No. 18	Photographs (A-E) of Juanita-Woodinville/Northeast 160th intersection
Exhibit No. 19	Letter dated August 23, 1996, from William Wiselogle (with attached letter from Mayor Curtin to Debra Merkley)
Exhibit No. 20	Site plan, MDNS and Environmental Checklist for Woodbridge Pond townhouses
Exhibit No. 21	letters from Doug and Renee Manzine and Joe and Karen Aquilar expressing their concerns about this project
Exhibit No. 22	Letter dated March 25, 1997, from City of Bothell (William Wiselogle) to Examiner
Exhibit No. 23	Tom Rengstorf resume
Exhibit No. 24	Tree survey map with photographs
Exhibit No. 25	Sheets L1 and L2 of Phase I of planting plan

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the hearing record March 31, 1997:

Exhibit No. 26	Resume of Dwayne Kohler
Exhibit No. 27	Site plan
Exhibit No. 28	Building elevations
Exhibit No. 29	Site planning evolution and comparisons
Exhibit No. 30	Tree location plan, photographs (19) and explanations
Exhibit No. 31	Sections A, B, C & D
Exhibit No. 32	Evaluation of and response to Exhibit 16
Exhibit No. 33	Typical building elevations
Exhibit No. 34	Exterior color samples for Northwest by Kelly-Moore to show typical color schemes
Exhibit No. 35	Still illustrations of computer models
Exhibit No. 36	Video of computer model
Exhibit No. 37	Geglia resume
Exhibit No. 38	Metro scan data
Exhibit No. 39	Sales date chart for Woodinville Condominium
Exhibit No. 40	Resume of James Barborinas